Responses to reviewers

Dear Editor,

We thank you and the reviewers for your precious time examining our manuscript and making comments to improve the current version. The authors have combed through all the comments and provided appropriate responses. We expect that the revised manuscript will meet your requirements.

We are available to consider any additional comments from this resubmitted version.

In the following, we present the responses to the comments.

Sincerely,

***S ènа Donalde Dolor ès Marguerite DEGUENON**

Laboratory of Applied Ecology, Faculty of Agronomic Sciences, University of Abomey-Calavi, Benin; Centre for Coastal Management, University of Cape Coast, Ghana ; BP 698 Calavi Benin; Tel: +229 67524917; email: donaldedeguenon@gmail.com; donalde.deguenon@uac.bj.

Below are the responses to the Reviewers' comments included in the revised version.

Reviewers 1

-The main issue of the work is the description of the method. Authors need to describe their approach better adding more details about the ML techniques.

Response: The method has been more described

-I did not understand where paragraph 2.4 is needed or why is included.

Response: Please, the paragraph 2.4 was the method description for *Greenhouse Gas Sequestration equation*

-Results are poorly described and section 3.1 is very general.

Response: Has been improved

-Also the title on the platform "Sea Level Rise impact based on Machine Learning and SLAMM model for modeling Greenhouse Gas Sequestration in Benin coastal ecosystems" is not the same as the one in the manuscript "Sea Level Rise impact based on Machine Learning and SLAMM model for modeling Greenhouse Gas Sequestration in Benin coastal ecosystems"

Response: That's true. We sent an email to the editors to have it corrected. They were supposed to do it because the revised manuscript version had been sent to them by email after some updates.